

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05740 01 OF 02 162115Z

63

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-04 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-03 H-01 INR-05

L-01 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15

USIA-06 ACDA-05 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 CU-02 SAM-01 OIC-01

DRC-01 /069 W

----- 014208

P R 162010Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8220

INFO USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 5740

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, PARM

SUBJECT: CSCE: CMS EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS AT MILITARY MANEUVERS -
IMS COMMENTS ON FRG SPEAKING NOTES

GENEVA FOR CSCE DEL

REF: USNATO 5736

FOLLOWING IS TEXT OF IMS COMMENTS ON FRG "SPEAKING NOTES" PRESENTED
BY IMS REP AT OCTOBER 15 POLADS (REFTEL). ACTION REQUEST:
DEPARTMENT COMMENTS IN TIME FOR CTOBER 22 POLADS.

BEGIN TEXT

GENERAL REMARKS

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05740 01 OF 02 162115Z

1. IT MIGHT BE BETTER TO KEEP THE APPROACHES FLEXIBLE AT THIS STAGE,
THAN TO SEEK TO DETERMINE THE DETAIL IN ADVANCE. EACH STATE WILL HAVE
ITS OWN IDEAS. SOME ALREADY INVITE OBSERVERS TO MANEUVERS AS A
NORMAL DIPLOMATIC/MILITARY COURTESY. ANY THRESHOLD DEVELOPED

FOR CSCE ALONE WOULD INVOLVE EITHER CANCELLATION OF EXISTING NATIONAL PRACTICES ON INVITATION OF OBSERVERS, OR THE CONTINUANCE OF THESE PRACTICES OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF CBMS, THE LATTER LEADING TO DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN TREATMENT OF PARTICIPATING STATES.

2. IT SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, THAT, JUDGEMNT OF MANEUVERS APPROPRIATE FOR EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS WILL VARY ACCORDING TO THE DIFFERENT POLITICAL, MILITARY AND GEOGRAPHIC SITUATIONS OF THE COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE CSCE (NATO, WP, NEUTRAL).

3.FOR NATIONAL MANEUVERS ON NATIONAL TERRITORY, IT MIGHT BE BEST TO LEAVE THE DECISION WHOLLY TO THE DISCRETION OF NATIONS CONCERNED. EACH WOULD THEN TAKE ITS DECISION, ON A BILATERAL AND VOLUNTARY BASIS, TO INVITE OBSERVERS AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF ITS EXISTING POLICIES AND PRACTICES.

4.FOR MULTINATIONAL MANEUVERS, SOME CO-ORDINATION WOULD BE NECESSARY WITHIN NATO AT LEAST REGIONALLY, TO EXAMINE PERIODICALLY WHICH OF THE PLANNED MULTINATIONAL MANEUVERS SHOULD BE OPEN TO ATTENDANCE BY OBSERVERS. THIS MIGHT BEST BE DONE BY MAJOR SUBORDINATE COMMANDS AND A RECOMMENDATION MADE THROUGH THE HOST COUNTRY'S NATIONAL MILITARY REPRESENTATIVE. THE FORMAL INVITATION COULD THEN BE ISSUED BY THE MEANS DESCRIBED AT PARA 5.

SPECIFIC REMARKS TO SPEAKING NOTES OF THE GERMAN DELEGATION

A. PARA 1: NIL

B. PARA 2: NIL

C. PARA 3: LINKING SIZE OF MANEUVERS SUITABLE FOR EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS WITH THOSE FOR ADVANCE NOTIFICATION WILL RAISE PROBLEMS.

THE CURRENT NATO APPROACH TO THE LATTER IS THAT THE THRES-
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 05740 01 OF 02 162115Z

HOLD SHOULD BE AT DIVISION LEVEL OR 10,000 MEN, THIS SEEMS LIKELY TO GO TO REINFORCED DIVISION OR 20,000 MEN. VERY FEW NATO COUNTRIES INDIVIDUALLY MOUNT NATIONAL MANEUVERS ON THAT SCALE. THENUMBER OF SUCH NATO MULTINATIONAL MANEUVERS ON THAT SCALE IS VERY LIMITED. THE EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS FOR MANEUVERS ON THAT SCALE WOULD BE RARE. FURTHER, THE MANEUVERS HAVING BEEN PRE-ANNOUNCED AS CBMS, THE EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS WOULD ADD LITTLE OR NOTHING TO CREATE CONFIDENCE. ON THE OTHER HAND THERE WOULD BE SOME GAIN FOR NATO IN INTELLIGENCE.

FOR THE SOVIETS, ITWOULD MEAN THEY WOULD ONLY ISSUE INVITATIONS TO MANEUVERS PRE-ANNOUNCED IN A BAND OF TERRITORY FOR WHICH EXTENTS HAVE TO BE AGREED. THE SOVIET OBLIGATION OR

COMMITMENT WOULD THEREFORE BE DIFFERENT IN KIND FROM THAT UNDERTAKEN BY OTHERS. FROM BOTH CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES AND INTELLIGENCE POINT OF VIEW, IT MIGHT BE PREFERABLE TO EXCHANGE OBSERVERS AT MANEUVERS OTHER THAN THOSE TO BE SUBJECT TO PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT. THIS, IN FACT, WOULD EXTEND THE COVERAGE OF WP AND NATO MANEUVERS, PROVIDE SOME ASSURANCE THAT THE PRE-ANNOUNCEMENTS ARE GENUINE AND GIVE NATO SOME GAIN IN INTELLIGENCE. IN SUM, IN TERMS OF CBMS, IT WOULD BE PREFERABLE NOT TO LIMIT EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS TO MANEUVERS SUBJECT TO PRIOR NOTIFICATION.

D. PARA 4: NIL

E. PARA 5: NIL

F. PARA 6: IT IS NOT CLEAR FROM THE GENEVA TEXT WHETHER PARTICIPATING STATES WOULD FEEL BOUND, IN EVERY CASE, TO ISSUE INVITATIONS TO ALL OTHER PARTICIPANTS. THE QUALIFICATION IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF THE GENEVA TEXT COULD BE READ EITHER AS LIMITING THE NUMBER OF INVITATIONS OR LIMITING THE NUMBER OF OBSERVERS WHICH EACH OF THE INVITED STATES MIGHT SEND.

PRESUMABLY, AS THIS IS FUNDAMENTALLY A CBM, THE EMPHASIS WOULD BE ON INVITING THE PARTICIPATING STATES WHOSE TERRITORY IS CLOSE TO THE AREA OF MANEUVERS, AND WHO, IF NOT INVITED, MIGHT FEEL SOME APPREHENSION. IT SHOULD NOT, FOR EXAMPLE, ERODE SPAIN'S CONFIDENCE IF SHE WERE NOT INVITED TO UK ARMY MANEUVERS IN THE FRG.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 05740 01 OF 02 162115Z

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 05740 02 OF 02 162151Z

63

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-04 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-03 H-01 INR-05

L-01 NSAE-00 NSC-05 PA-01 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15

USIA-06 ACDA-05 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 CU-02 SAM-01 OIC-01

DRC-01 /069 W

----- 014673

P R 162010Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8221

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT
USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 5740

G. PARAS 7, 8, 9 AND 10: NIL

H. PARA 11: THE FIRST ALINEA OF THIS PARA IS NOT CONSIDERED NECESSARY AND USEFUL. THE OBJECTIVE IS PRESUMABLY TO REJECT AN OBSERVER WHO IS "PERSONA NON GRATA" AS AN INDIVIDUAL. HOWEVER, ANY STATE WHICH SO WISHED COULD LABEL SUCH A MAN WITH ANY NAME AND PROVIDE SUITABLE IDENTIFY DOCUMENTS. THE HOST STATE WOULD EITHER HAVE TO ACCEPT HIM AT FACE VALUE OR REJECT THE OBSERVER ON ARRIVAL AND RISK FRICTION (IF HIS IDENTIFY IS PENETRATED). THE SAFEGUARD OF PARA 11, ALINEA 2 WOULD SEEM TO BE ADEQUATE. THE NAMES OF SUCH OBSERVERS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL, TOGETHER WITH OTHER IDENTIFYING DATA, SHOULD BE FURNISHED NOT LESS THAN 20 DAYS BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE MANEUVERS TO THE REPRESENTATIVE DESIGNATED IN THE INVITATION.

I. PARA 12: NO OBJECTION FROM MILITARY POINT OF VIEW. THE INVITING STATE WOULD PROVIDE, IF IT IS CONSIDERED NECESSARY, TO CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05740 02 OF 02 162151Z

SUCH OBSERVERS SUITABLE LODGING, MEALS AND MEDICAL SERVICES AND OFFER ANY SUPPORT. IT WILL ARRANGE FOR SUCH OBSERVERS TO BE APPROPRIATELY BRIEFED ON THE MANEUVER SCENARIO AT THE BEGINNING AND, AS APPROPRIATE, ON THE RESULTS AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MANEUVER. NOTES WILL BE PERMITTED TO BE TAKEN AND RETAINED, SUCH BRIEFINGS WILL BE CONDUCTED IN THE LANGUAGE INDICATED ON THE INVITATION.

L. PARA 13: IT IS CONSIDERED THAT THERE IS NO NEED TO SPECIFY SUCH RESTRICTION. IT WOULD APPEAR TO QUALIFY AND ERODE PARA 12 (ALINEA 4) CONSIDERING THAT, IF RADIO AND COURIER WERE DISALLOWED, THE MEANS OF IMMEDIATE COMMUNICATION WITH OWN EMBASSY AVAILABLE TO OBSERVERS WOULD BE UNDER EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF THE HOST NATION.

M. PARAS 14 AND 15: NIL

N. PARA 15: THE CONTENT OF THIS PARA IMPLIES THAT AN OBSERVER WOULD BE LIABLE TO HAVE AN ESCORT AT ALL TIMES. PARA 12, LINES

1 AND 2, HOWEVER, REQUIRE ESCORTS ONLY DURING INSPECTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATION ON SPECIAL INVITATION.

CONCLUSION

5. THE MC AT THE PRESENT TIME HAVE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION THE PROPOSAL IN DISCUSSION IN GENEVA AND HAVE NOTED THAT THIS PROPOSAL TO EXCHANGE OBSERVERS DOES NOT RAISE ANY PARTICULAR PROBLEM FROM A MILITARY POINT OF VIEW. THE MC HAVE ALSO NOTED THAT REPORTS OF THE IMPLEMENTING ARRANGEMENTS AND NECESSARY SAFEGUARDS HAVE TO BE DEVELOPED AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME.

6. THE IMS WILL UNDERTAKE A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE
CONDITIONS AND FACILITIES THAT NATO COUNTRIES SHOULD PROVIDE
AND EXPECT.
END TEXTMCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 OCT 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO05740
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryxwe.tel
Line Count: 222
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: USNATO 5736
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <26 MAR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <22 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: CMS EXCHANGE OF OBSERVERS AT MILITARY MANEUVERS - IMS COMMENTS ON FRG SPEAKING NOTES
TAGS: PFOR, PARM
To: STATE INFO GENEVA
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT
USDOCOSOUTH

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005